

#11  
T16/04  
AW

Atty. Docket No. COM31 P-301

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 12 2004

OFFICIAL

Art Unit : 2175  
Examiner : Thuy N. Pardo  
Applicant : Therese A. Voevodsky  
Appln. No. : 09/602,921  
Filing Date : June 23, 2000  
Confirmation No. : 1017  
For : HUMAN RESOURCES INFORMATION  
INTERNET ACCESSIBLE DATABASE

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111

In response to the Office Action mailed August 11, 2003, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the following remarks.

REMARKS

In the above-referenced Office Action, claims 1-21, all of which remain present in this application, were rejected. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15 and 17-21 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,401,079 (hereinafter Kahn); and claims 2, 9 and 16 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahn in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,737,592 (hereinafter Nguyen). For the reasons further set forth below, Applicant again respectfully submits that claims 1-21 are allowable. Applicant has, concurrently herewith, filed a request for a two-month extension of time to respond to the present Office Action.

At the outset, and as is disclosed in Applicant's Specification, a computer system programmed according to Applicant's claimed subject matter is particularly useful in determining whether employees with a desired employee attribute are adequately compensated, as compared to employees in other non-related companies. Applicant's Specification (see, for example, p. 4, ln. 23) defines an employee attribute as "skills and responsibilities" possessed by a given employee. Additionally, while the Office Action states (Point B) "it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., 'skill and responsibilities') are not recited in the